DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 472 32 EA 003 705

AUTHOR Mader, William D.
TITLE Pennsylvania Annual Evaluation Report: Department of Education, 1970.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Board of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Coordinators, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Pennsylvania State Department of Education; reaction reports from Teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (EA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053472

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1970

EA 003 705

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Raymond P. Shafer, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
David H. Kurtzman, Secretary of Education
B. Anton Hess, Commissioner for Basic Education
Donald M. Carroll Jr., Assistant Commissioner for Basic Education

BUREAU OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION
John L. Kennedy, Director
William M. Dallam, Assistant Director for Development
John M. Hyams, Coordinator, ESEA Title I

Report Prepared by:
William D. Mader
Curriculum Development Specialist
Division of Development
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword i

I. Basic Statistics for Fiscal Year 1969 1

II. State Educational Agency Title I Staff Visits to Local Educational Agencies 4

III. Improve the Quality of Title I Projects 7

IV. Effect Upon Educational Achievement 11

V. Effect of Title I 14

VI. Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged 18

VII. Cooperation Public and Nonpublic Schools 19

VIII. Inservice Programs 19

IX. Community and Parental Involvement 20

Appendix: Map showing location of educational development centers
Evaluation Data
The School Community Coordinator Service
Program Shippensburg Conference
Behavioral Objectives "A Program Approach"
Proposed Youth Services Program

FOREWORD

The annual report is submitted to the U. S. Office of Education to document the success of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as enacted and amended by the Federal Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The following objectives were pursued in the preparation of this report:

1. To support the concept of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.
2. To recognize the educational community in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who is receiving and effectively using Title I funds to strengthen the educational opportunity of the economically and educationally deprived child.
3. To attest to the creativity of the educational community as evidenced by the innovative programs implemented in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
4. To support the "feeling" that students are benefiting from the educational actual and related supportive services being implemented with Title I funds.
5. To commend the educational community for its continuing and expanding leadership role in the social community as evidenced by the increased involvement and establishment of lay advisory bodies in the activities of the school and particularly the Title I program.

6. To commend the educational community, the Department of Education and the U. S. Office of Education for the supportive and cooperative relationship that exists among the agencies which have enabled students in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to receive supplemental programs designed to meet their specific needs.
7. To commend the public and nonpublic school personnel for cooperative pursuit of excellence in compensatory program planning.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania submits this report with the comfortable feeling of justification by data for support of our narrative response to 1970 evaluation questions.

The format of this report adheres to the structure and placement of information as proposed by the 1970 ESEA Title I evaluation questions supplied by the U. S. Office of Education.

Local educational agency Title I applications are on file with the Department of Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I. BASIC STATISTICS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1969

There are 670 local educational agencies in Pennsylvania; of these, 660 were eligible for Fiscal Year 1969 Title I grants. Six hundred and thirty-six school districts participated in Title I projects this year. The Pennsylvania Department of Education received, approved and funded 489 proposals, including four state institutions for neglected and delinquent children. This number reflects the information by local educational agencies of cooperative projects.

TABLE I - 1

Number of Local Educational Agencies Participating in the State

Time Of Participation	Number Participating	Percentage
School Year	95	15
Summer	66	11
Both	469	74
TOTAL	636	

The Title I programs submitted to the state by the 489 participating local educational agencies served 234,188 public school students and 31,368 nonpublic school students at an estimated cost of $48,500,000.

TABLE I - 2

ESEA Title I Instructional Activities (Regular Term)
1969 - 1970

	Activity	Public	Private	Total Number of Children	Neglected and Delinquent	Estimated Cost
1.	English-Reading	104,884	17,814	122,698	1,301	$9,973,651
2.	Pre-K and Kindergarten			15,396	6	2,603,504
3.	Mathematics	29,099	6,036	35,135	456	1,812,181
4.	English Language Arts	42,717	2,062	44,779	129	1,080,772
5.	Teacher Aides	14,362	1,881	16,243	63	868,385
6.	Art	40,190	4,333	44,523	118	855,516
7.	Music	26,031	2,112	28,143	183	557,178
8.	Cultural Enrichment	32,653	15,777	48,430	487	534,128
9.	Science - Social	12,991	1,280	14,271	160	483,032
10.	Science - Natural	12,329	1,512	13,841	63	374,102
11.	English - 2nd Language	1,194	345	1,539	55	347,083
12.	English - Speech	4,515	1,908	6,423	106	304,103
13.	Home Economics	68,622	10,099	78,677	72	275,324
14.	Physical Ed/Rec.	14,889	1,885	16,774	124	238,659
15.	Television	27,518	577	28,095	8	188,550
16.	Vocational Ed.	1,617	50	1,667	55	140,205
17.	Tutorial	2,065	429	2,494	480	111,427
18.	Business Education	1,970	516	2,486	46	101,065
19.	Foreign Language	552	43	595		96,620
20.	Aides	256	91	347		91,712
21.	Day Care Center	110		110		81,400
22.	Industrial Arts	511	96	607	35	36,761
23.	Learning Center	471	32	503		26,417
24.	Camping - Ed.	140	35	175		13,500
25.	Special Education	297		297	60	11,178
26.	Agriculture	317		317		10,400
27.	Audio-Visual Aids	670	47	717		7,000
28.	Handicapped-Spec. Ac.	2,153	125	2,278	99	355,945

TABLE I - 3

ESEA Title I Supportive Activities
(Regular Term)

	Service	Pre-School	Public	Private	Total Number of Children	Neg. & Del.	Estimated Cost
1.	Guidance Counseling	1,717	54,458	13,253	69,428	524	2,261,917
2.	Library	2,378	82,600	14,375	99,353	884	2,110,831
3.	Social Work	1,358	62,787	10,724	74,878	182	1,919,551
4.	Food	4,769	14,106	1,346	20,221	144	465,506
5.	Transportation	1,218	21,666	2,417	25,301	677	355,050
6.	Psychological	548	6,424	1,055	8,027	187	324,952
7.	Health - Dental	2,608	17,127	2,568	22,303	157	229,153
8.	Attendance	861	9,827	822	11,510	126	216,299
9.	Health - Medical	2,879	12,491	1,881	17,251	129	207,262
10.	Speech Therapy	180	2,346	1,208	3,734		135,871
11.	Aides (Other)	241	1,297	600	2,138		41,809
12.	Handicapped- Spec. Ser.		283	40	323		40,500
13.	Curriculum Mat. Cent.	326	3,108	418	3,852		33,755
14.	Clothing	119	1,385	129	1,633	33	27,264
15.	Teacher Aides	41	377	20	438		20,950
16.	Psychiatrist	70	447	68	585		15,098
17.	Learning Center		706	47	753		14,085
18.	Home & School Visitor	29	395	33	457		12,987
19.	Clerical		693	152	845		4,900
20.	Activities		327	8	335		250

II. STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY TITLE I STAFF VISITS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

The organizational structure of the Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation--administrator of the Title I program for the Commonwealth--and of the other bureaus contained in the Office of Basic Education of the Department of Education permits and causes visitations of professional state employes to nearly all local educational districts in the Commonwealth each year. It is customary practice for Department of Education personnel to consult with, and be consulted with, every program operated within the framework of public education.

In addition to the regulatory functions and consultations performed by all professional personnel as indicated, the Title I staff and other professional personnel have made, and are making, visitations to Title I projects, evaluations of Title I projects and lend assistance to local educational districts in developing comprehensive compensatory programs.

Pennsylvania has established 16 regional offices (Educational Development Centers) in 16 strategically located cities of the state. (See Appendix for Pennsylvania map and designated Educational Development Centers). One of the functions of the EDC personnel is to <u>assist</u> local educational districts in planning a project, filing of application, preapproval of proposed project. Another function is to <u>consult</u> with local educational districts during implementation, operation and frequent visitations. Much of their work and consultations are performed by use of the conference phone technique, by telephone and by written communication. The following table reflects the type of activity performed by EDC personnel for the Title I program.

TABLE II - 1

Number and Objective of Consultations by Educational Development Center

Planning	Program Development	Program Approvals	Program Implementation	Program Operation	Visitation	
152	76	170	78	175	140	Personal Contact
38	40	130	84	125		Telephone/Letter

Definition of activities performed in the above table are:

1. Planning--meeting with school systems to inservice staff (via telephone or personal contact) on procedures and the interpretation of the act.
2. Program Development--consultant services to school districts concerning program design and/or program submission requirements and procedures.
3. Program Approvals--preliminary review of all proposals for completeness of application, proper form and proper validity.
4. Program Implementation--follow-up of programs to consult with districts to insure intent of law compliance.
5. Program Operation--consultation with school districts experiencing particular operating problems.
6. Visitations--visitations for the purpose of offering assistance. Courtesy visit.

The Division of Development, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, is charged with the responsibility of administering the Title I program and has direct contact with each local educational agency receiving an allocation. These contacts with the local educational agency were in the form of consultations via telephone or by personal visitation to the local educational agency. An approximate activity schedule is presented in the following table. Description of activities follows the table.

TABLE II - 2

Number and Objective of Consultation by Title I Staff

Planning	Program Development	Program Approvals	Program Operation	Visitations	Evaluations	
128	157	110	73	145	275	Personal Contact
361	332	489	45		489	Telephone/Letter

1. Planning--dissemination of an interpretation of program guidelines.
2. Program Development--telephone or personal visit to school districts concerning programs and interest of law.
3. Program Approvals--final approvals of all projects.
4. Program Operation--consultation with districts regarding interest of law (most of these handled by EDC's).
5. Visitations--comparative analysis of program description and operation with view toward policy decisions.
6. Evaluation--conducted by Division of Evaluation, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation.

III. Improve the Quality of Title I Projects

To improve the quality of a Title I project, one must be able to identify and evaluate components. Previous federal and state guidelines were somewhat vague which made evaluation difficult. March 18, 1968, the Federal Government published ESEA Title I Program Guide Number 44. This enabled the Federal Government to construct new guidelines which were much more exact. The Pennsylvania Department of Education, as a supplement to the federal guidelines, developed a checklist for local educational agencies with certified adherence to the federal procedures.

The emphasis on the Fiscal Year 1970 guidelines was an attempt to pin point those children who could be identified as educationally or economically deprived. The greater use of local advisory committees, 50 per cent Title I parents, was also stressed. The thinking was thus: concerned citizens (parents of the eligible students or from target schools) should be a great source of suggestions as to the needs of the students. These citizens could also suggest some possible solutions. The viewpoints of a group of concerned citizens not directly connected with education should give diversity to the planning. The local advisory committee is not in a position to make decisions but only to give advice.

The following list of areas where the advisory committee can help the local educational agency was developed by the Department of Education for its "Handbook For Pennsylvania School District Advisory Committees."

1. To assist and advise the school district in:
   a. Developing programs in cooperation with existing community action programs in the locality.
   b. Bringing together community resources to attack the problems of target area children, including assistance in locating appropriate sources of aid.
   c. Overall planning, developing, implementation and dissemination of information relative to the objectives of compensatory programs.
   d. Acting as a sounding board for any individual or group to suggest additions to or changes in the school district's proposed compensatory education programs.
   e. Evaluating the ESEA Title I programs.

The narrative portion of the Title I application was also revised. The local educational agency had to be much more specific in defining its program. This enabled the Department of Education to more easily identify the quality of the project. If the project did not meet standards, changes or modification could begin immediately.

Pennsylvania, in Fiscal Year 1969, introduced the idea of writing the objectives of the program in performance or behavioral terms. The year 1970 saw full implementation of this change. Dr. Robert Piatt and Mr. Joseph Dunn of the Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation presented numerous workshops on performance objectives to Title I project directors at selected locations around the state. In addition, the bureau has also distributed a Behavioral Objectives presentation (a program

approach) to aid local educational agencies in preparation of their applications (copy included).

The reasons behind the use of performance objectives lies in the ease with which one can determine the terminal activity of behavior expected of the students and the ease of coordinating performance objectives with a method of evaluation.

In an effort to improve the quality of Title I projects, the Division of Development--which has responsibility for fiscal and program review of Titles I and III--participated in the Seventh Annual PDE Curriculum Conference at Shippensburg State College on June 23-26, 1970. A copy of the program for the conference is located in the appendix. Refer to pages 32 and 33 for the program conducted for federal programs and how it relates to the improvement of Title I projects.

The Division of Development, formerly the Division of Compensatory Programs, in an attempt to improve the quality of Title I projects and to insure proper participation of nonpublic schools, conducted the Tamiment Conference on April 27-30, 1970. Approximately 1,200 chief school administrators, federal coordinators, project directors, teachers and representatives of the nonpublic schools attended. A copy of the program for the conference is located in the appendix.

B. Insure Proper Participation of Nonpublic School Children

In previous years the Pennsylvania Department of Education has required a letter from all nonpublic schools in the local educational agencies area stating that they had been contacted and the part they played in the planning of the Title I project. This procedure was not very satisfactory. The Department of

Education developed a standard procedure and form for the local educational agency to follow in regard to contacting nonpublic schools. Results were more satisfactory from this procedure.

Because the vast majority of nonpublic schools in the state are Catholic parochial schools, a concerted effort was made again to contact each school by informing the major parochial school officials of their Title I rights.

There has been an increasing amount of cooperation between the public and private schools in Pennsylvania. In the first year of the project, very little cooperation existed. Under pressure and guidance from the Department of Education, the public schools have become more receptive and private schools have become less demanding; understanding has thus improved.

C. Modify Local Projects in Light of State and Local Evaluation.

Professionals in the Pennsylvania Department of Education have always suggested modifications of Title I projects after evaluation. Experience has enabled them to identify projects which have a limited chance of success. In contacts by telephone or in person, much constructive criticism has been made and changes have taken place.

Fiscal Year 1970 saw full implementation of a procedure introduced in 1969. The Division of Evaluation of the Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation has responsibility for on-site evaluation of all Title I projects. Approximately 275 of the 489 projects were evaluated during the year. Plans are to continue these evaluations on a frequency of one-third of the total number each year.

Most evaluations are not made by members of the Pennsylvania Department of Education staff but by Title I teachers, administrators and project directors who have attended an in-service training session conducted by the Division of Evaluation. Mr. Kenneth Adams, who has responsibility for Title I evaluations, attempts to select an evaluator from a list of 600, that has experience in the fields covered in the project to be evaluated. The on-site evaluation is followed by the presentation of a comprehensive report to the local educational agency and the Division of Evaluation. Mr. Adams forwards a copy of the evaluation report to the Curriculum Development Specialist that has responsibility for that project. The Curriculum Development Specialist analyzes the district's project and the evaluation report to prepare a follow-up letter containing complements, concerns, recommendations. Action can be taken at this point to make changes in a project if any nonacceptable or ineffective activities are identified.

IV. EFFECT UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

A. In an attempt to validate the effectiveness of Title I programs, the Division of Compensatory Programs selected reading programs for 2nd and 5th grades as their target area. A valid sample (about 100 of the 300 districts that involved elementary reading projects) was selected. Data was collected in the form of pre and post program test results. The information was requested in the form of grade equivalents. Only those results where the same test was used for both pre and post data is accepted.

RESULTS OF READING PROJECTS AS MEASURED BY A COMPARISON OF PRE AND POST TEST RESULTS FROM A RANDOM SAMPLE OF 2nd AND 5th GRADE STUDIES IN ESEA TITLE I PROJECTS IN PENNSYLVANIA, 1968-69

	2nd Grade			5th Grade		
Test Used	Number Of Students Tested	Average Gain Per Year As Indicated By Pre Test For Each Student Before Enrollment in Title I Projects	Average Gain Per Year As Indicated By A Post Test For Each Student Involved In Title I	Number Of Students Tested	Average Gain Per Year As Indicated By Pre Test For Each Student Before Enrollment in Title I Projects	Average Gain Per Year As Indicated By A Post Test For Each Student Involved In Title I
Gates MacGintie Reading Test	503	.80	.90	398	.55	.90
Metropolitan Reading Test	396	.97	.78	.90	.60	.67
California Reading Test	.85	.75	1.2	145	.66	.56
Stanford Reading Test	441	.54	.80	346	.55	.97

ALL RESULTS ARE GIVEN IN THE FORM OF GRADE EQUIVALENTS WHERE 1.0 = GROWTH FOR ANY NORMAL CHILD IN A SCHOOL YEAR

The following is a brief description of the method used to extract the pertinent data from the material received.

For each child tested, two scores were received. To get a child's average gain for the number of years in school, one was subtracted from the pre test score and the result was divided by the number of years of school attendance. To get the average, simply add the gain per year for all pupils and divide by that number. To get the gain for the year under Title I, subtract the pre from the post test score, add these for all students and divide by that number to get the average.

B. What are the common characteristics of those Title I projects in your State that are most effective in improving educational achievement?

If by educational achievement one means the per pupil advancement as measured by pre and post program standardized tests, the following is probably true.

1. The program should be concentrated in grades pre-K thru 6. After 6th grade, gains as measured by standardized tests fall off sharply.
2. Where the need is well established for <u>each</u> child.
3. Where good rapport exists between the project director or the Title I home and school visitor and the eligible family.
4. Where constant feedback as to success or failure is given to the student and his parents, and where adjustment is made to correct the problems.
5. Where a good pupil-teacher ratio and good rapport exists, the method matters little; success can still be significant.

C. What evidence, if any, have you found in your state that effectiveness of Title I projects is related to costs?

Although no concrete evidence exists to document that the effectiveness of Title I output is related to costs, strong indicators do exist that suggest that program design and implementation are correlated with cost factors. For example, one usual indicator of a good compensatory program is concentrated effort rather than a shotgun approach.

V. EFFECT OF TITLE I

1. On Administrative Structure

A. State Educational Agency

1. Led to the establishment of a Division of Compensatory Programs in the Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation in the Department of Education. More recently, the Division of Planning and Compensatory Programs were reorganized into the Division of Development which has responsibility for ESEA Titles I and III.
2. Led to the hiring of professional and clerical personnel to man the division.
3. Led to the Department of Education's assigning professional to orient local educational agencies.
4. Caused the state legislators to recognize needs of disadvantaged persons and the need for laws to provide funds.

5. Caused a closer working relationship between local educational agencies and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or the U. S. Office of Education.
6. Influenced the state educational agency in the establishment of more efficient micro and macro evaluation techniques.
7. Helped to initiate the organization of a State Government Task Force in Compensatory Programs.
8. Increased the Division of Evaluation to cover on-site Title I evaluations.
9. The Division of Development was restructured into a regional concept to agree with the six basic regions as developed by the Governor's office. The ultimate objective is to have two professionals responsible for each region. Their duties will include Titles I, III, Drop-out Prevention, Follow Through, Migrant, Neglected and Delinquent and Model Cities.

B. Local Educational Agency

1. Led to the hiring of personnel to coordinate federal funds.
2. Led to the hiring of additional professional staff to meet needs.
3. Enabled local educational agencies to purchase equipment to meet needs of students.
4. Led to in-service training for professional and paraprofessional personnel.

5. Caused cooperative working relationship between local school district and community action and/or social agencies.

6. Improved communication between local educational agency and members of the community.

7. Enabled many school districts to offer educational and recreational summer programs.

C. Nonpublic Schools

1. Caused breakdown of barriers to reach ultimate educational goals.

2. Led to provision of hardware and software for many nonpublic participants.

3. Led to provision of many services that would not ordinarily be provided.

4. Led to common understanding and cooperative planning between public and nonpublic schools.

5. Caused a closer rapport between nonpublic schools and the Department of Education.

2. On the Educational Practices

A. State Educational Agency

1. Caused investigation for the need of sound educational programs for the development of instructional objectives of such programs and methods to attain the objectives.

2. Gave impetus to a state assessment of the educational problems of inner-city ghetto areas, general urban areas and rural areas.
3. Brought about innovative and flexible programs aimed at student needs and a higher quality of education for all children.
4. A factor in establishing a comprehensive approach to compensatory programs.

B. Local Educational Agency

1. Caused the re-evaluation of objectives, curriculums and student-teacher ratios.
2. Caused the selection and hiring of certified specialists and clerical personnel.
3. Caused orientation and in-service training for personnel in the use of materials and equipment.
4. Caused evaluation to be built into programming.

C. Nonpublic Schools

1. Enabled nonpublic school students to receive many services they would not ordinarily receive.
2. Gave nonpublic schools access to equipment which facilitates learning.
3. Caused public and nonpublic school administrators to plan programs coordinately.

VI. ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

A. The State of Pennsylvania under Section 2502.2 of the School Laws of Pennsylvania provides an additional one dollar per day to each school district reporting attendance of migrant school children in its districts during the regular school year. Under Section 2509.2 of the School Laws of Pennsylvania, county boards of education are eligible to receive funds to conduct educational programs for migrants during the summer months.

Partner Cities (a state program similar in some respects to Model Cities) is in the planning stage. Initially it will be aimed at the 17 largest cities in the state. More specific details will be available later.

A bill has been presented to the state legislature to provide $5,000,000 to promote quality education in the districts cited by the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission for lack of desegregation. The money is to equalize comparability within the district.

The state legislature has provided the Office of Federal Programs, directed by Victor Celio, with $500,000 for the purpose of helping local districts provide the matching funds required by the Federal Government to receive aid under specific programs.

B. The School District of Harrisburg developed a program during Fiscal Year 1970 which they hope to implement this year. The proposed "Youth Services Program" is being developed to take advantage of the Elementary Adjustment Counseling Program conducted by the school district as part of their Title I project. A copy of the proposal is located in the appendix.

VII. COOPERATION PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Department of Education requires that joint planning be a part of every Title I proposal. Form PIBE 258 (Statement of Planning Participation by Nonpublic School Officials) is required as a part of each project submission.

Local educational agencies reported 31,368 nonpublic school children participating in Title I programs. Two hundred and seventy-three schools report nonpublic school children are provided services and/or instructional activities in programs funded by Title I.

Most private school children participate in projects operated at public school facilities. Therefore, the quality is no greater or no less than that for public school students.

Nonpublic Schools Participating in Title I

Regular	55
Summer	47
Regular and Summer	217

VIII. Inservice Programs

A. Three hundred and forty-four local educational agencies conducted in-service for 3,690 Title I teachers and 2,267 teacher aides.

B. Highlands School District in Allegheny County, under the direction of Mr. C. W. Schmitt and Mrs. Ruth Ripper, have conducted a teacher-teacher aide in-service program in their own district and have served as consultants for other districts attempting to develop a similar program. The following is a brief summary of the program conducted this past summer.

Wednesday 9:45-10:45 General Session

Mr. Schmitt and Mrs. Ripper present a dialogue discussing the work, background and image of the teacher aide.

11:00-12:00 Small Group Discussion

The idea is to answer questions that have developed as a result of the first presentation or to continue along with the presentation of the first hour to bring out additional areas of involvement for the aides and teachers.

Thursday 9:00-10:20 General Session

Encourage an exchange of ideas between the teachers and teacher aides regarding conduct and performance in the classroom.

It is also ideal to have teachers and teacher aides observed in action by the consultants who would be responsible for a follow-up session or report to make suggestions which may improve performance.

IX. COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Local educational agencies report that in 380 instances community action agencies were directly involved and active in the planning of Title I projects. Most of the remaining 109 projects complied with the requirements that the community action agencies be involved in the planning of the programs.

Parental involvement increased. Three hundred and twenty-five districts reported inclusion of an advisory board which included parents in the development stages of the proposal.

Title I projects which have evolved via a process of comprehensive development appear to be the most effective in terms of student achievement and in promoting educational change in the school districts. The basic process is outlined on the next page.

Development Process:

1. Assess needs of identified students
2. Research to support needs and to analyze needs
3. Identify and analyze immediate (priority) needs
4. Identify existing constraints which cause the needs
5. Select problem
6. Define objectives
7. Prepare solutions to meet objectives
8. Prepare draft proposal
9. Submit proposal for review
10. Revise draft if necessary
11. Select appropriate funding source and write proposal
12. See local commitment to proposal
13. Submit proposal for funding
14. Secure tentative approval
    a. in-service staff for change
    b. create organizational structure
15. Negotiate with funding age y for final approval
16. Secure final approval
17. Implement
18. Manage and evaluate
19. Disseminate

B. TITLE I PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT: EXAMPLES OF OUTSTANDING PROGRAMS

Chester School District's federal program director, Joseph M. Joseph, has developed an idea which he calls "Proxy Parents."

About two years ago a questionnaire was circulated to the parents in the school district. The results indicated only 30 per cent of the parents had heard of ESEA and fewer knew what it was attempting to do. To inform these parents, many of whom were ashamed, fearful or unable to come to school meetings, the "Proxy Parent" was developed.

The "Proxy Parents" were individuals from various sections of the community, trusted by the residents, to act for them. These "Proxy Parents" are not school personnel nor do they represent the school; they are true representatives of the parents. The success of the program has been amazing. Knowledge of the program and what it attempts to do have increased 100 per cent.

The following lists indicate the capacity of the "Proxy Parents."

1. Dissemination of ESEA information from school to home.
2. Dissemination of general information from school to home.
3. Visitation to families for medical, dental, psychological notices needed by the school.
4. Follow-up visitations for unanswered report forms.
5. Oral or written conferences with principal and referees.

1. Represent ESEA parent at school when such parent is unable to attend.
2. Carry messages from ESEA parents back to school.
3. Carry messages from other parents back to school.
4. Accompany ESEA children on field trips when parent is physically unable to attend.
5. "Baby-sit" on a voluntary basis to allow ESEA parents to visit schools.

The School District of Philadelphia has developed "The School-Community Coordinator Service," a program to improve relations and communication between the home and the school. A detailed description of the project is located in the appendix.

THE

SCHOOL - COMMUNITY

COORDINATOR

SERVICE

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA
Division of Pupil Personnel and Counseling

The School Community Coordinator Program has been developed to improve channels of communication between the schools and the communities they serve. Funded under ESEA Title I, the program places one or more coordinators in every elementary, secondary and special school serving large numbers of pupils living in the city's pockets of poverty. Coordinators work with both public and parochial schools. Bilingual, Spanish-speaking coordinators are assigned to elementary schools located in Puerto Rican communities. The concept of the school community coordinator was pioneered and developed by Philadelphia's Great Cities School Improvement Program. Evaluations of the coordinator service of this experimental program proved beyond doubt its effectiveness in helping both school and community.

Coordinators are hired through the regular examination process and wherever possible community leaders participate on the oral examination committee. To be eligible for the position, coordinators must:

1. Be a member of the neighborhood residing within the geographical boundaries of the school community.
2. Have a high school education or its equivalent.
3. Show an excellent understanding of the community and a warm relationship with the people living there.
4. Demonstrate leadership ability through participation in community, recreational, church, home and school association or agency activities.

5. Possess qualities of loyalty, integrity, good judgment and intelligence.

The service is part of the Division of Pupil Personnel and Counseling and receives its overall direction from the division director. An assistant director of the division has been assigned to lead the program. He is responsible for its administration, its development and improvement, for the orientation and training of the 220 coordinators assigned to the project and for the orientation of school staff and community. He is aided by three supervisors who, in addition, guide, assist and work closely with approximately 70 coordinators assigned to each of them. The assistant director and the supervisors serve as resource and consultant personnel to the schools and communities participating in the program.

The major objectives of the program are:

1. To keep the community oriented to and informed about the school's program.
2. To keep the staff informed concerning the composition, distinctive needs and concerns of the community.
3. To develop programs designed to engage the community in home-school related programs (home and school association).
4. To participate in community activities designed to develop a wholesome, constructive and cohesive community.
5. To assist families in an understanding of school and community facilities so that they will be in a position to accept and use them.

6. To provide the staff with information gained from contacts with the home to resolve more intelligently existing problems.

To fulfill these responsibilities, the coordinator engages in the following types of activities:

1. Becomes familiar with the school's philosophy, objectives and program.
2. Becomes familiar with the special services provided by the school system and the particular school and helps to interpret these.
3. Meets and plans with small or large school-community groups at either the school or in the community. Meetings might be as informal as a "tea" for a few parents in a neighbor's home or as formal as a large meeting in a church, community center or school auditorium.
4. Arranges for and participates in orientation meetings in the community and at school.
5. Helps to plan for and participates in conferences for parents developed to discuss home, community and school problems. Assists in obtaining specialists to participate at these meetings.
6. Becomes familiar with the work and programs of community organizations, social agencies, church groups and youth services in the community and helps to interpret these to parents.
7. Visits specific homes of pupils as a direct referral from some member of the school staff.

8. Develops a resource file of parents who can be called upon to fill leadership roles and to enhance the school's program.
9. Helps to develop and enliven the Home and School Association by actively recruiting members, by participating in planning and regular sessions and by guiding parents with ability toward leadership roles.
10. Helps devise programs which will induce parents to participate in such school-related activities as discussion groups, adult education classes, cultural enrichment trips and the preparation of curricular materials.
11. Helps organize parent activities which would lead to the cultural enrichment of adults in the community.
12. Meets new families entering the school community to extend a welcome from the school and to acquaint them with school and community services.
13. Participates in community activities and represents the school, upon the principal's request, at community meetings.
14. Meets with the school staff to keep it informed of community developments and of the work of the school community coordinator.
15. Supports such special school district programs as Get Set, Head Start, Outreach and after school classes for the academically talented.
16. Helps to interpret and support school district policy in such concerns as the annual budget or the introduction of new programs.

The need for coordinators to be "on call" at all times makes it difficult to define hours of employment. For administrative purposes, these hours are established as extending from 8:45 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. with an hour for lunch. When an inordinate amount of time beyond these hours is required, principals may allow coordinators compensatory time. The work calendar extends from the first weekday of September to the last weekday of June. Working days throughout the school year are those of the instructional staff.

Records of importance used in the program are noted below:

1. Log of Daily Activities--On this form the coordinator briefly accounts for her day. Such information as the name and address of person visited, the time and nature of the visit and the source of referral are noted. The log should be filed, available for review by school and coordinator service administrators.
2. Monthly Summary--This record summarizes the information listed on the daily log. The information assists school and coordinator service in appraising the nature of the coordinator's work and in evaluating the program.
3. Referral Form--This form provides an efficient way for referring cases to the coordinator. Basic information supplied by the form eliminates unnecessary conferences.

Requests for coordinator's service will come from a multitude of sources. It is suggested that the principal, administrative assistant or vice-principal assist the coordinator in considering the appropriateness of these requests.

The coordinator joins the school as a new member of its team who, because of status in the community, knowledge of its problems and needs, will add a new dimension to the school's program. The coordinator's success, however, will depend upon relationships with colleagues within the school.

The PRINCIPAL, as the school leader, is administratively responsible for the coordinator program within his school and will be responsible for the coordinator's activities. The coordinator's ability to relate to the staff and to inform them of her work will depend upon her participation in the professional and social life of the school. Thus, it is important for the principal to emphasize the coordinator's status as a participating member of the school staff.

The COUNSELOR and the coordinator will work as closely together as any two members of the school team. The coordinator will provide the counselor with essential information, facilitate parental visits to school and help to interpret the counseling program. While the coordinator is not professionally trained to work with many student and family problems, her close relationships with the community and the flexibility of her working hours place her in a position to be most helpful to the counselor.

The ATTENDANCE OFFICER and the coordinator also represent an effective teaming of services. The coordinator will recognize the attendance officer as the professionally trained specialist equipped to work with attendance problems in the home, school and community. School attendance referrals should continue to be channeled to the attendance officer. The school community coordinator may make a preliminary home visit at the request of school professional personnel to confirm the school's belief

that the child is legally absent.

There will be many occasions when the attendance officer and the coordinator will need to confer to share information. Throughout the day the coordinator may discover what appears to be illegal school absence. These cases should be discussed with professional school personnel to determine the advisability of referral to the attendance department. At times the coordinator also will learn that children with severe physical and emotional problems are legally excused from school attendance with official approval through the attendance department.

The coordinator will be of great value to the TEACHER in providing important information not readily accessible and will enlist the support of parents in many classroom activities. She will be a means of speedy communication with the home and the flexibility of her working hours will permit her to meet with working parents in the evenings or on weekends. The coordinator should handle teacher requests with dispatch and must respect confidential information given to her.

A number of PARENTS will know the coordinator from past community and school activities. Many more will come to know her for she will seek them out to welcome them to the community, to extend the help of the school, to relate special school programs, to seek information, to enlist their support or to "lend a helping hand." As a respected member of the community and as a neighbor, she will be able to reflect and represent parents' concerns.

The coordinator must treat each parent with dignity and must respect information given to her in confidence. She must be as available to parents as she is to school personnel. Often comforting or reassuring words will do wonders to enlisting family support with school related programs.

There will be times when a family with children in different schools, and with many problems, may have a number of coordinators as well as other workers interested in its welfare. The coordinator should recognize the possible danger of overwhelming such parents with help. An additional worker's concern might well be the "straw that broke the camel's back." In such cases the coordinator should bring her concern to her liaison at school and to her supervisor. Often it will be necessary for coordinators working with such a family to develop a unified plan of cooperative action.

The coordinator will participate in many programs of AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY GROUPS. She will acquaint parents with information about the agencies and, when the reassurance of her presence is needed, might even accompany parents to certain agencies.

In routine matters concerning recreational activities, health facilities, adult educational opportunities, etc., she may suggest the use of available agencies. In more complex situations, or where a formal referral to an agency is required, the coordinator should seek the help of the counseling service.

She should support the work of neighborhood associations for it is often from these "grass roots" groups that the desire

for community self help arises. As a representative of the school district and the school, she will be a dispatcher of information and an ambassador of good will. She will extend to the community the school's desire to be of service.

School Community Coordinator Service
Division of Pupil Personnel and Counseling
Room 419 Strawberry Mansion Junior High School
Ridge Avenue at Susquehanna Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19132
CEnter 6-5863 - 5864